

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
49	1530	9		EPA	see additional projects that should be included in the 'relationship to other on-going actions' and updates to ones included that have changed		
50	1531	9			inclusion of Trinity River and Klamath projects (sidebar?) discussion		
51	1532	9		WAPA	cum discussion of air quality impacts through development of alternative energy sources		
52	1533	9			cummulative discussion by resources and by project identified		
485	1534	9-5	ISDP writeup	Mike Ford, DWR	The first two objectives of ISDP are correctly stated however, the third objective "to reduce fishery impacts in the Delta." is not an ISDP objective and should be omitted from this text.	T	
484	1535	9-6	first column, first and second paragraphs	Mike Ford, DWR	1) ISDP only proposes dredging in Old River, it does not propose dredging in Victoria Canal, North Canal and Middle River as the text states, 2) the loss of habitat associated with dredging is short-term only, for 2-3 years and is not permanent. The text should clarify this. , 3) Potential adverse impacts include....negative flows in channels leading to the south Delta due to operation of the barriers... This is inaccurate and/or misleading. The barriers do not cause negative flows in these channels, they occur with or without the barriers. It would be fair to say that the barriers can cause an increase in negative flows in some channels under low flow conditions.	T	

H-000622

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
472	1536	9-		K. Kelly, DWR	<p>The cumulative impact chapter (Chapter 9) section is going to get alot of public attention. CALFED's assessment of these projects will have a significant impact upon the projects' success. The discussion of these projects' impacts needs to be as objective as possible. I recommend CALFED agency staff familiar with these projects review and possibly rewrite the appropriate sections of text to make sure it is correct.</p> <p>CALFED staff should evaluate the rewritten chapter in its entirety to assure it presents the information objectively. Also, some projects are not included in the draft. The criteria for the selection of projects should be included. Rich Breuer has listed some other projects in one of his comments that should be considered for inclusion.</p> <p>The project proponents or lead agencies should be identified for each project. Also, if a project has received Biological Opinions (especially for Delta species) it should be discussed in this chapter.</p>	P	

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
482	1537	9-1		Rich Breuer DPLA (DWR)	<p>There are a number of other projects in various stages of planning and development that should be included in the cumulative impact section, because of their potential impacts to water quality. They are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. City of Tracy - Wastewater -Currently discharges to Old River. They forecast an increased discharge from 9 to 15 mgd in the near future, with expansion to 32.5 mgd projected for year 2012. Contact: Lydia Holmes -Carollo Engineers (510) 932-1710 City of Tracy Contact - Steve Bayley 2. Mountain House Project - same area as City of Tracy's discharge. Large housing development, marina, wastewater treatment plant. Contact Kitty Walker Senior Planning -San Joaquin County Community Development Department (209) 468-3144 3. Discovery Bay -Byron Tract -Recently switched over to UVA treatment of wastewater. Planned future expansion of treatment plant. 4. Gold Rush City - City Of Lathrop - Large planned community, marinas, golf courses, and amusement park. Adjacent to the San Joaquin River. 5. City of Stockton. - Stockton plans to divert water for municipal use and potentially may increase wastewater discharge. No contact person known. 6. Barker Slough Watershed Management Project (Solano County Water Agency) 7. City of Tracy Westside Channel Outfall System. Planned storage and discharge of storm water runoff to Old River. 	T	
982	1538	9-1		Holt, USBOR	The cumulative impacts discussions are basically restricted to impacts within the Central Valley as if it existed in a vacuum. However, the impacts of decisions made concerning the Valley either affect or are affected by decisions in the Trinity, Klamath, and Colorado River Valleys. We have physical links between the Trinity/Klamath system and the Sacramento and shared service area ties to the Colorado River. These connections need to be acknowledged and explored.		
73	1539	9-1		Steve Shaffer, CDFA	Ch 9 - This section is wholly inadequate. It does not address cumulative impacts of CALFED actions, in the context of other actions. There is no discussion of cumulative impacts on agricultural resources (land and water).		

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
480	1540	9-1	Cumulative Impacts	V. Pacheco, DWR	The development of a "Gold Rush Theme" complex on Sherman Tract in the Delta, enlargement of the Tracy sewage treatment plant, and development of the Mountain House community may contribute additional cumulative impacts not addressed in the report.	T	
481	1541	9-1	9.1	C. Enright, DWR	Suisun Marsh Preservation Agreement Amendment Three should be considered in the cumulative impacts analysis.	T	
643	1542	9-1	9.1	Rick B., CALFED	Table reference needs to be chnged since it will be moved to section 9.2.		
1101	1543	9-1	9.1	CY, EPA	Add SWP supplementary water purchase program		
1102	1544	9-1	9.1.1	CY, EPA	Update American River Water Resource Investigation, along the lines: "In the FEIS, issued....., the Bureau of Reclamation indicated that at this time it has not identified a federal action associated with this program."		
473	1545	9-1	s9.1.& 9.4	Dan Flory, DWR	To make this a little more user friendly, I would recommend some discussion on what is in the impact analysis and what is not. This is especially true with the CVPIA discussion which seems to be split. A paragraph or two on the content of chapter 9 and how it relates to chapter 2 would be helpful.	P	
474	1546	9-10	section 9.2.1	K. Kelly, DWR	This discussion should include the ISDP. This discussion does not correspond with table 9.1-1. Other projects discussed in Chapter 9 could effect the inflow to the Delta but are not discussed in Section 9.2.1. As it currently written the section is very critical of Delta Wetlands. I think this discussion should be more objective and discuss some of the potential benefits of Delta Wetlands.	P	
655	1547	9-10	9.2.1	Rick B., CALFED	Identify which projects are causing reduction of lower american river flows in first sentence. There is no mention of CVPIA and Interim south delta in this section or CVPIA in any other section.		
1105	1548	9-12	9.2.4	CY, EPA	Is there a Supplemental Water Supply Project on the San Joaquin, in addition to EBMUD's American River proposal? Correction needed.		
54	1549	9-12	9.3		Explain that significant impacts are already identified within the resource sections, concentrate that while an issue may not have been significant for the project individually, cumulatively it is raised by the level of significant. Make sure addressed.		

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
656	1550	9-13	9.4	Rick B., CALFED	Delete 3rd paragraph.		
1254	1551	9-14	third full paragraph	FWS	The Service recommends that plant and animal surveys be conducted in project areas whenever there is potential for the presence of listed, proposed and/or candidate species, not just when initial surveys have shown that listed species are present. Please change the language to state that pre-project surveys will be conducted done whenever there is potential for the presence of listed, proposed and/or candidate species in the project area.		
657	1552	9-15	9.4	Rick B., CALFED	The last paragraph this page needs to be the first paragraph for this whole section. Move to page 9-13.		
475	1553	9-2		K. Kelly, DWR	All of the projects discussed are not included in table 9.1-1. Also, the Supplemental Water Supply Project could fall under two categories -- Service areas outside of the central valley or the Bay Area. Whichever you choose, be consistent.	P	
55	1554	9-2			include interim south delta needs to be included on table (described in text but left off of table)		
644	1555	9-2	table 9.1.1	Rick B., CALFED	Move to section 9.2; there is no mention of CVPIA actions or interim south delta in this table. They need to be added. Following changes need to be made to column titled Potential Cumulative Issues - Delta Region 1st bullet Benefical "and detrimental" impacts to fisheries ", terrestrial species and species listed as threatened and endangered"; Sacramento Region - These activities must do something beneficial for water supply/reliability. Same for Supplemental Water Project in SJ Region.		
483	1556	9-2	Table 9.1-1 Delta Region	K. Nelson, DWR	Regarding potential cumulative impacts of the Delta Wetlands Project: I don't see the benefits of the two developed habitat islands recognized here.	T	
486	1557	9-2	T-9.1-1	P. Wendt, DPLA (DWR)	Under "Delta Region"; Delta Wetlands Project--- Add: Adverse impacts to export WQ.	T	
1253	1558	9-3	first column, third paragraph, fourth sentence	FWS	Replace this sentence with: "Vegetation and associated wildlife along the North and Middle Forks of the American River canyon would be impacted by dam construction and operation. At least 2,360 acres of riparian forest, wetlands, and upland forests would be impacted; these impacts would not be fully mitigable."		

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
476	1559	9-3	section 9.1.3	K. Kelly, DWR	CVPIA. The impact upon water supply resulting from the dedication of 800,000 acre-feet should be discussed here along with the relationship of CVPIA to the CALFED program. It is just too big of an item to be covered by the Chapter's introductory paragraph. The water supply impact should also be included in the table.	P	
645	1560	9-3	9.1.2	Rick B., CALFED	Delete 3d and 4th paragraphs		
646	1561	9-3	9.1.3	Rick B., CALFED	This section is not discussed in the table.		
53	1562	9-4			delta wetland discussion, add sentence that discusses loss of ag land associated with delta wetland project		
56	1563	9-4		EPA	reference to EBMUD municipal water project - in San Joaquin section, there is a project of the same name - what is the San Joaquin project? Same as EBMUD project? Clarify		
477	1564	9-4	section 9.1.4.	K. Kelly, DWR	I believe Delta Wetlands has received biological opinions from FWS, NMFS and possibly DFG. This discussion should acknowledge that. It is significant information for a decision maker.	C	
487	1565	9-4	9.1.4	K. Nelson, DWR	I still find no discussion on the biological benefits of the two proposed habitat islands for the Delta Wetlands Project.	T	
647	1566	9-4	9.1.4	Rick B., CALFED	Delete last 3 paragraphs.		
478	1567	9-5	section 9.1.6.	K. Kelly, DWR	I recommend DWR to rewrite this section. As currently written, it is just a little off the mark and doesn't accurately represent the ISDP. We will send over replacement text.	C	
648	1568	9-5	9.1.5	Rick B., CALFED	Delete last 3 paragraphs		
1103	1569	9-5	9.1.5	CY, EPA	The EBMUD proposal is currently undergoing public review. Update to reflect this.		

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
649	1570	9-5 to 9-6	9.1.6	Rick B., CALFED	Not in the summary table; deletelast two paragraphs.		
488	1571	9-6	Edits to description of ISDP	J. Turner, DWR	Top paragraph, 3rd sentence...limited channel dredging in the Old River ,Victoria Canal, North Canal, and Middle River ;... [The channel dredging is only in Old River] Top paragraph, last sentence---...control structures to change flow patterns in the South Delta, not just San Joaquin River 2nd paragraph, 8th line, should say reverse flows, not negative Third paragraph last sentence...However, the operation of either the Grant Line or Head of Old River barriers...	T	
1104	1572	9-6	9.1.6	CY, EPA	The text of ISDP should more clearly distinguish actions being done as temporary measures, and elements proposed and evaluated in the ISDP DEIS. On page 9-6, first paragraph, after the sentence ending "in the South Delta channels": start a new paragraph which explains that the DEIS was released, that the elements of the proposal are those measures listed as "additional" (channel dredging, forebay intakes, barriers...), that proponents are in formal ESA consultation.		
650	1573	9-6	9.1.7	Rick B., CALFED	Delete last paragrph		
651	1574	9-7	9.1.8	Rick B., CALFED	Delete last paragraph		
652	1575	9-7	9.1.9	Rick B., CALFED	Delete last paragraph		
653	1576	9-8	9.1.10	Rick B., CALFED	delete last paragraph		
654	1577	9-8	9.1.11	Rick B., CALFED	delete last paragraph		
479	1578	9-9	section 9.2.	K. Kelly, DWR	Section 2.1 is referred to in error.	C	

A #	#	Page Number	Line, Figure, or Table No.	Commentor	Comment	T	P
489	1579	9-9	9.2	K. Nelson, DWR	Compared to the thoroughness of the rest of the EIR, the Cumulative Impacts section seems very brief and glossed-over. It seems that there should be a fairly in-depth discussion of the cumulative impacts of the simultaneous implementation of CALFED (Category III), CVPIA, SWRCB and other large programs.	C	
21	1601	Chapter 9		Robin Reynolds, CDFA	Cumulative Impacts. There is no treatment of cumulative impacts to, or mitigation of cumulative impacts to agricultural resources. This will require a major effort to correct.		